DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 825 RC 016 614

AUTHOR Jensen, Leif
TITLE Rural-Urban Differences in the Utilization and Ameliorative Effects of Welfare Programs.
PUB DATE 2 Feb 88
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Rural Sociological Association (New Orleans, LA, February 2, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Low Income Groups; Metropolitan Areas; Poverty; Poverty Areas; Poverty Programs; Rural Areas; *Rural Urban Differences; Urban Areas; *Welfare Recipients; *Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS Aid to Families with Dependent Children; Nonmetropolitan Areas

ABSTRACT

Some observers believe that welfare programs have an urban bias; however, the rate of poverty is higher in rural than in urban areas. This study establishes metro and nonmetro differences in the use of welfare and the degree to which it reduces poverty. Data from the U. S. Census Bureau's March 1987 Current Population Survey are analyzed using multivariate techniques. The study finds that poverty rates are about 1.5 times greater in nonmetro than in metro areas, and that family income in metro areas exceeds that in nonmetro areas by 37 to 46%. Further, data indicate that the severity of nonmetro poverty equals that of poverty in central cities, where about 15% of families have income below the poverty threshold. Nonmetro families, however, have a much lower rate of welfare receipt, about 5%, as opposed to 10% for families in central cities. Four measures of amelioration all demonstrate that welfare programs in nonmetro areas are less successful in boosting the income of recipients above the poverty level. Multivariate analyses confirm the smaller effects of welfare in nonmetro areas, and they suggest that four variables fully explain the tendency of nonmetro families not to use welfare services: presence of a working head of household, older family heads, home ownership, and absence of programs that supply Aid to Dependent Children for Unemployed Parents (AFDC-UP). An 18-item bibliography and 5 tables are included. (CH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296825

Rural-Urban Differences in the Utilization and Ameliorative Effects of Welfare Programs*

by

Leif Jensen

Economic Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LEIF JENSEN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Rural Sociological Association, New Orleans, February 2, 1988. I acknowledge the helpful comments of Max Jordan, Peggy Ross, Linda Ghelfi and Elizabeth Morrissey. Any remaining errors are my own.

RC016614

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

It is well known that poverty rates have been perennially higher in rural than urban areas of the United States (Jensen 1987), and this continues to be true today (Rodgers and Weiher 1986).[1] Despite this, many Americans perceive that poverty is predominantly an urban problem, and some have suggested that government poverty programs contain an urban bias (Hoppe 1980; Institute for Research on Poverty 1980; Watkins and Watkins 1984).

A partial explanation for this is simply that, compared to urban areas, rural poverty is much more geographically dispersed, rendering it less conspicuous. While this dispersion has lead to a popular neglect of rural poverty, on a more practical level it restricts access of the rural poor to social services more readily available to the urban poor (Deavers, Hoppe and Ross 1986). Despite the differences between metro and nonmetro poverty, the rural poor must rely on the same "safety net" as the urban.

A key feature of this safety net is the set of government welfare programs. The term "welfare" has been used to refer to a variety of programs. In this paper welfare income is that which derives from Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and general assistance (GA).[2] Given the higher incidence of poverty in nonmetro areas, the comparative effectiveness of welfare programs in nonmetro versus metro America is an important policy question. There is evidence that the rural poor are less likely to avail themselves of public

assistance (Carlson, Lassey and Lassey 1981), and that the ameliorative effect of public assistance is less in rural than urban areas (Jensen 1987).

In this paper I establish urban-rural differences in the utilization of welfare and the degree to which it reduces poverty. The unit of analysis is the family, defined as two or more persons living together who are related by blood, marriage or adoption. Basic descriptive statistical techniques and multivariate methods are used to analyze data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey. I open with a discussion of basic measures of economic well-being among families in nonmetro and metro areas. Data for families in central cities are also provided. This is followed by an investigation of rural-urban differences in the ability of welfare to alleviate poverty. Several measures of this ameliorative effect are considered. Multivariate methods are then used, first to decompose rural-urban differences in the ameliorative effect of welfare, and then to explain metro-nonmetro differences in the propensity of families to receive welfare benefits.

DATA ANALYSIS

Baseline Data

Before examining metro-nonmetro differences in the ameliorative effects of welfare programs, I present fundamental measures of economic well-being (Table 1). This establishes an aggregate picture of rural-urban differences in the need for income security programs.

Comparing the first two columns of Table 1 it is apparent that economic deprivation is more prevalent in nonmetro than metro areas. The percent of families with income below the poverty threshold[3] is 15.2 and 10.1 in nonmetro and metro America, respectively. This gap holds for more severe depths of poverty as well. Over ten percent of nonmetro families have income amounts below 75% of their poverty cutoff. Less than seven percent of metro families are so deprived. That one in ten rural families have total income below this level -- $8,402 for a family of four -- is startling considering the truly meager lifestyle afforded by an income so low. Several observers have documented the near impossibility of making ends meet with a poverty level income (Schiller 1980); 75% of this income can only entail much greater difficulty.

Considering a yet deeper level of deprivation, about six percent of nonmetro families have income below half their poverty level. This compares to four percent in metro places. Taken together, these results confirm that poverty rates are about one-and-a-half times greater in nonmetro than metro America.

Data on annual family income and family earnings also indicate greater economic well-being of metro areas. Mean total family income in metro areas exceeds that of nonmetro areas by 37%. The corresponding figure for annual family earnings is 46%. While some assert that this income gap is tempered by the greater cost of living in urban areas (Watkins and Watkins 1984), another work casts doubt on any great cost of living difference between metro and nonmetro

places (Ghelfi 1987).

Much policy and public attention has been paid to poverty in the inner cities of metro areas. The recent flurry of work on the urban "underclass" (Wilson 1987), attests to the persistence of this topic. The data in Table 1 justify this concern. By all three measures, poverty is as prevalent in central cities as it is in rural areas. Respectively, 15.2 and 15.4 percent of nonmetro and central city families are poor. The gap is greater when more severe poverty levels are considered. That is, while central city poverty exceeded nonmetro poverty by only about one percent in relative terms, the gap was closer to nine percent when the 75% and 50% poverty thresholds are used. Still, while central cities do have the highest incidence of poverty, the rates are not appreciably greater than those found in nonmetro areas; and while inner city poverty has garnered the greater popular concern, the absolute number of poor families is about the same in nonmetro America.

Given the higher incidence of poverty in central cities and nonmetro areas, one would expect greater use of welfare there. As seen Table 1, this expectation holds only for central city families, among whom 10.3 percent received welfare income in 1986. (It is noteworthy that this is substantially less than their poverty rate.) Despite the fact that their poverty rate was about the same as central city families, only 5.9 percent of nonmetro families received welfare income. This figure is not significantly different from that of metro families generally (5.8%), who have a far lower poverty rate

than nonmetro families. In sum, considering their high poverty rate, nonmetro families have a remarkably low rate of welfare receipt.

Not only do nonmetro families have a comparatively low rate of welfare receipt, among those families that did receive welfare, the mean annual welfare income was lowest among nonmetro families (Table 1). The mean receipt among nonmetro families ($2,928) is significantly less than that for metro families ($3,652) and for central city families ($3,911).

Ameliorative Effects

Since nonmetro poor families are far less likely than their metro counterparts to receive welfare income, and since the average annual welfare receipt (among recipients) is lower among nonmetro than metro families, it is reasonable to expect that welfare's ameliorative impact on family poverty is less in nonmetro America. The data in Table 2 strongly support this hypothesis.

I present four measures of amelioration. In the first, for each family I subtract welfare income from total family income. This pre-welfare income is then compared to the absolute poverty threshold. The first ameliorative effect measure is the percent of those families with pre-welfare income below poverty whose total family income is at or above poverty. In other words, among those families that are poor without welfare, what percent are brought above poverty via welfare? As seen in Table 2, surprisingly few families enjoy a positive ameliorative effect, so defined. Only about 4% of pre-

welfare poor families are brought above poverty in metro areas, though somewhat more (4.8%) are positively affected in central cities. As expected, however, the ameliorative effect is considerably lower (1.9%), in nonmetro America.

The second and third ameliorative effects are variants of the first. The second asks, among those families whose pre-welfare income is less than 75% of their absolute poverty threshold, what percent are brought above this cutoff via welfare income? The third measure is the same, but uses 50% of the absolute poverty threshold. Both the second and third rows of Table 2 continue to show that the ameliorative effect of welfare on family poverty is considerably greater in metro areas (central cities in particular) than in nonmetro places. Only 19.7% of those families with pre-welfare income below 50% of poverty are brought above this level via welfare. This compares to 29.4% in metro areas generally, and 33.0% in central cities.

These binary measures of welfare's ability to alleviate poverty have some intuitive appeal in view of policy goals -- welfare either does or does not lift families out of poverty. A less stark approach is to ask to what degree welfare closes the gap between a family's pre-welfare income and its poverty line.[4] This measure, expressed as a percentage, is referred to herein as closure.

The data on closure (Table 2, row 4) indicate again that welfare has a much greater ameliorative effect in metro than nonmetro areas. On average, less than 16% of the poverty gap among nonmetro families

was closed via welfare benefits, while the corresponding figure for metro families was about 29%. Closure was even greater among central city families, among whom 31.4% of the pre-welfare poverty gap was closed.

To summarize, at this descriptive level I have shown that the ameliorative effect of welfare — its ability to reduce poverty — is greater in metro than nonmetro America. Moreover, according to all four measures, the ameliorative effect is stronger in central cities, than in metro areas generally. This is so despite the commensurate degree of deprivation in central city and nonmetro places. In the balance of this paper I explore the rural-urban differences in ameliorative effects more closely.

The descriptive analyses have revealed important reasons why welfare does not alleviate poverty as much in rural areas as in urban places. The rural poor are not as likely to receive welfare in the first place, and those that do, do not receive as much on an annual basis as their metro counterparts. A reasonable explanation for the latter is that the nonmetro poor tend to live in states, particularly in the South, that have lower benefit levels.

To quantify these explanations, in Table 3 I present an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression of the closure variable on three independent variables. The first of these predictors is type of residence, measured as two dummy variables — metro outside central cities and nonmetro. The comparison group is families in central cities. The second independent variable, designed to measure

interstate differences in welfare benefits, is the maximum AFDC payment to one needy adult and two children (with no other income) for the family's state of residence (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 1987). These payment levels range from $118 in Alabama to $740 in Alaska. The final variable predicting closure is simply whether the family received AFDC and/or general assistance in the year prior to the survey. With the exception of type of residence, all variables reference the family's situation in 1986.

In Table 3 I present three OLS models that were estimated on pre-welfare poor families. The first includes only the type of residence variables. This model confirms that the ameliorative effect of welfare is significantly less in nonmetro areas than it is in central cities. Model 2 includes the family's state benefit level. This variable has a positive effect meaning that families living in states with higher benefit levels enjoy a greater ameliorating effect. That the effect of nonmetro status is attenuated by nearly half (from -.156 to -.082), confirms that part of the reason for the smaller ameliorative effect among nonmetro families is that they live in states with lower benefit levels. Even in model 2, however, the ameliorative effect is significantly less in nonmetro places than central cities. To determine the degree to which this might be due to their lower likelihood of receiving welfare, model 3 includes the term indicating whether welfare income was received in the previous year. As expected, this term has a strong and positive effect. More importantly, the effect of nonmetro status becomes positive and

insignificant. This indicates that an important reason why welfare alleviates poverty to a smaller degree in nonmetro areas, is because the nonmetro poor are less likely to receive it than their metro counterparts. For the remainder of this analysis I seek to determine why this is so.

Determinants of Welfare Receipt Among Poor Families

At a theoretical level, there are many factors that could determine whether a given poor family will receive welfare income. One important group of variables describe a family's eligibility for AFDC or general assistance. Obviously, in order to qualify for AFDC, a family has to have dependent children, and in about half the states, the recipient cannot be married with a spouse present. However, simply because a family is eligible for welfare, does not mean they will receive it. Some parents may simply be unaware that they are eligible, while others may not wish to bear the social stigma attached to welfare receipt (Feagin 1975).

In this section, logistic regression analysis is used to estimate models of welfare receipt among families. This method is called for since the dependent variable is binary — either a family did or did not receive welfare income in the year prior to the survey (1986). The intent is to confirm that nonmetro families are significantly less likely to receive welfare income, and if so, to explain this difference.

Definition of Variables and Hypothesized Effects. Here I define the

independent variables and discuss their hypothesized effects on the propensity of families to receive welfare. Type of residence is defined as it was in the OLS models. That is, with the comparison group being families in central cities, two dummy variables identify metro families outside central cities, and nonmetro families. I expect the effect of the latter variable to be negative and significant, indicating a lower probability of welfare receipt among nonmetro poor families.

A variable indicating that a family head did not work at all in the previous year is expected to have a positive effect on receipt. Other things equal, families headed by a non-worker will be more likely to turn to welfare as a means of subsistence.

Two binary variables, one indicating the presence of own children under 18 years old, and the other indicating that the family is headed by a married couple, are used to control for eligibility for AFDC.[5] Empirically, it is difficult to model eligibility with CPS data. This is both because the many variables needed are not available, and because of vast interstate differences in eligibility criteria. I look at these two variables — presence of children and family type — because they are important and available, and because they may vary systematically between metro and nonmetro areas. I expect presence of children to have a positive effect on receipt, and married couple headship to have a negative effect, other things equal.

Three additional independent variables describe the family head.

These are education, race and age. Education, defined as grades of school completed, has a theoretically ambiguous effect on welfare receipt. The better educated poor could be more likely to receive benefits if they are more cognizant of available programs and how to apply for them. They could be less likely to receive if they are more aware of and more qualified for employment opportunities. The better educated poor may also be more sensitive to mainstream attitudes against welfare receipt. Since AFDC is generally utilized by the young, age of family head is expected to have a negative effect.

Finally, three additional situational variables are considered. First, home ownership is expected to have a negative effect on receipt. While not itself an eligibility criterion, it may be related to the ownership of other assets which can compromise eligibility. Secondly, families that live in states that offer AFDC to unemployed parents (AFDC-UP) are expected to be more likely to receive welfare than those that do not. Theoretically, poor families will seek welfare in direct proportion to average benefit levels. Accordingly, I expect state benefit level (maximum benefit payment to one needy adult and two dependent children) to have a positive effect on receipt, ceteris paribus. The correlation matrix for these variables appears in Table 4.

Results. I present the logistic regression models of welfare receipt in Table 5. Model 1 contains only the two dummy variables for type of residence. As expected, compared to central city poor

families, nonmetro poor families are significantly less likely to receive welfare income. Metro families outside of inner cities are also less likely to receive than inner city families, but the effect is not as strong.

The OLS models suggested that much of the reason why the ameliorative effect of welfare income was less in nonmetro areas, was because the nonmetro poor are less likely to receive it in the first place. With this now confirmed by model 1, it is important to determine why.

The first explanation considered pertains to work commitment. It has been asserted (Watkins and Watkins 1984) and research has shown (Bloomquist, Jensen and Teixeira 1987) that rural people have a particularly high attachment to the labor force. This is born out by the negative association (-.093) between nonmetro residence and having a family head who did not work in the previous year (see Table 4). Having a working head can reduce the propensity to receive public assistance because it reduces eligibility and may reflect a stronger commitment to work over welfare, other things equal. Conversely, if a head does not work, the family is left with fewer alternatives to transfer programs. The coefficient for having a non-working head is strong and positive; these families are more likely to receive welfare. More importantly, the effect of nonmetro residence is attenuated, suggesting that part of the reason why the nonmetro poor are less likely to receive welfare than their central city counterparts is because they are more likely to have a working

head. The same can be said for metro residents outside central cities.

In model 3, two additional independent variables are added. As noted above, the presence of own children and being a two-parent family, can greatly affect eligibility for AFDC. Both variables behave as expected, and the effect of nonmetro residence is further attenuated. As indicated by the correlations in Table 4, nonmetro families are slightly less apt to have own children and more likely to be headed by a married couple. Both of these factors work to reduce welfare receipt among nonmetro families.

Six additional variables are entered in the final model (model 4). The bivariate relationships reveal that four of these variables further explain the lower welfare receipt among nonmetro families. That is, 1) nonmetro families are less likely to be headed by a non-white and non-whites are more likely to receive welfare; 2) nonmetro family heads tend to be older, and older heads are less likely to receive; 3) nonmetro poor families are more likely to own their home and home ownership lowers receipt and; 4) nonmetro poor families are less likely to live in states with AFDC-UP, and the latter increases the likelihood of welfare receipt. As a result, the negative direct effect of nonmetro residence on receipt is completely explained.

Separate models (not shown) indicate that among the final variables entered, home ownership and AFDC-UP, play the greatest role in explaining away the nonmetro effect. That home ownership should have such a strong effect is intriguing, since Federal requirements

exclude the value of homes from eligibility criteria in all states. It may, however, be related to the ownership of other assets that do cause ineligibility. Home ownership may also indicate greater economic well-being among these otherwise poor families, and less need for welfare.

That AFDC-UP should increase receipt is also interesting considering marital status of family head is controlled. It is plausible, however, that states with AFDC-UP have more liberal eligibility criteria in other ways as well. These states may also have less of a negative stigma attached to welfare receipt. It is noteworthy that, by and large, states without AFDC-UP are clustered in the south and southwest of the United States. These states tend to offer lower welfare benefits (Levitan 1985) and have stricter eligibility criteria in general (Department of Health and Human Services 1987).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Welfare programs such as AFDC and general assistance were designed primarily to provide income security and alleviate poverty (Levitan 1985). Over the past decade or so, there has been increasing concern that welfare fosters dependency and fails to promote self-sufficiency through gainful employment (Murray 1984). These concerns have given rise to welfare reform proposals that emphasize remedial education, skill training, and job placement, and have sparked considerable interest and new research on welfare dependency (e.g., c.f. Hopkins

1987). To some extent, the recent furor has blurred the original intent of welfare -- to ameliorate poverty.

In this paper I have sought to refocus attention on the degree to which welfare alleviates poverty, by highlighting and explaining rural-urban differences in this ameliorative effect. I opened with descriptive tables which revealed considerably greater poverty and lower incomes in nonmetro as compared to metro areas. Despite this, the rate of welfare receipt was not appreciably higher in the countryside, and mean welfare receipt among recipients was considerably lower there.

The resurgence of interest in an urban underclass has once again placed urban poverty at the forefront of national attention (Wilson 1987). The data in Table 1 justified this concern, but central city poverty rates were not appreciably greater than those of nonmetro families. Consistent with the underclass notion, inner city families were far more likely to receive welfare and recipients received considerably higher total benefits than their counterparts in nonmetro areas.

Considering their comparatively light use of welfare despite a high poverty rate, it is of little surprise that the ameliorative effect of welfare -- the degree to which it reduces poverty -- was much lower among nonmetro poor families (Table 2). This finding was consistent across four different measures of amelioration.

A key reason for the lesser ameliorative effect among nonmetro poor families was their lower propensity to receive any benefits at

all. Nonmetro poor families were less likely to receive welfare than their central city counterparts because, on average, they are 1) more likely to have a working family head, 2) less likely to have own children present, 3) more likely to be headed by a married couple, 4) less likely to be headed by a non-white, 5) apt to have older heads, 6) more likely to own their home, and 7) less likely to live in a state that offers AFDC-UP.

These findings have implications for recent attempts at welfare reform. At this writing, the Family Welfare Reform Act of 1987 (HR 1720) has passed the House and awaits Senate debate. As noted above the bill stresses remedial training and job placement services. Many able-bodied welfare recipients would be required to at least look for work, if not hold a job, or face loss or reduction of benefits (Knudsen 1987). This bill is the result of the mounting concern over welfare dependency. I have argued that this concern arises largely from observations of inner city poverty and scholarly work on the urban underclass. If enacted, however, the new welfare system will also be serving the rural poor. If the thrust of the reform is to instill a greater work ethic and more stable family environment then it is less relevant in nonmetro areas. I have shown that nonmetro poor families are more likely to have working heads and be headed by a married couple. One aspect of the bill that would disproportionately benefit the nonmetro poor is the nationalization of the AFDC-UP program. Since the nonmetro poor are relatively overrepresented in states without AFDC-UP, and since they are more

likely to be married, they should be significantly helped by this provision.

This paper represents a rudimentary foray into the topic of rural-urban differences in the ameliorative effects of public assistance programs. Future analyses will look not only at AFDC and general assistance, but also at Supplemental Security Income (SSI) which provides cash assistance to the aged, blind and permanently and totally disabled. Since a disproportionate number of the nonmetro poor are aged (Hoppe 1980), and since SSI benefits tends to be higher than those of AFDC (Levitan 1985), the ameliorative effect of SSI may not be much lower in rural than urban places. Again however, this will hinge on participation. Future analyses will also look beyond families to include single individuals as well.

FOOTNOTES

[1] In this paper I use the terms urban and metro, and rural and nonmetro interchangeably. In the data analysis, however, the key empirical distinction is between metro and nonmetro areas.

[2] I sometimes refer to these programs as public assistance. While technically correct, public assistance also includes Supplemental Security Income (SSI) which are aimed toward the aged, blind and disabled poor. I do not consider SSI in this analysis.

3 Here I use the official definition of absolute poverty (U.S. Census Bureau, 1987), whereby a family is poor if their total annual income is less than the amount needed to provide a minimum standard of living.

[4] Among families in poverty, the difference between their total income and the poverty threshold is frequently referred to as the poverty gap.

[5] That a family is headed by a married couple does not necessarily mean it will be ineligible for AFDC. Some states offer AFDC to married couples if one or both of the parents are unemployed (AFDC-UP). Also, it is possible for a married couple to have an unwed daughter with a dependent child and for the daughter to receive AFDC.

The latter circumstance points to an analytic problem that deserves mention. My unit of analysis is the census family, which is defined as all people living together who are related by blood, marriage or adoption. This family unit is more inclusive than the family definition used by AFDC. To determine eligibility, AFDC looks only at the characteristics of the prospective AFDC parent and his/her dependent children. I use family head variables to monitor eligibility. To the extent that AFDC parents are not the family heads, my methodology mismeasures certain eligibility criteria. This problem is less relevant for the aggregate ameliorative effect measures, than it is for the multivariate analyses of welfare receipt.

REFERENCES

Bloomquist, Leonard E., Leif Jensen and Ruy A. Teixeira. 1987. "'Workfare' and Nonmetro America: An Assessment of the Employment Opportunities for Nonmetro Welfare Clients." Paper presented at the Ninth Annual Research Conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Bethesda, MD, October 29-31.

Carlson, John E., Marie L. Lassey and William R. Lassey. 1981. Rural Society and Environment in America. New York, NY: Macgraw-Hill.

Deavers, Kenneth L., Robert A. Hoppe and Peggy J. Ross. 1986. "Public Policy and Rural Poverty: A View From the 1980s." Policy Studies Journal, 51(2): 291-309.

Feagin, Joe R. 1975. Subordinating the Poor: Welfare and American Beliefs. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ghelfi, Linda M. 1987. "Income, Needs and Expenditures: Metro-Nonmetro Differences in Wisconsin." Paper presented at the 50th annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Madison, WI, Aug. 13-15.

Hopkins, Kevin R. 1987. Welfare Dependency: Behavior, Culture and Public Policy. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, OS, ASPE. September. Washington, DC: USGPO.

Hoppe, Robert A. 1980. "Despite Progress, Rural Poverty Demands Attention." Rural Development Perspectives, (March): 7-10.

Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin Madison. 1980. "On Not Reaching the Rural Poor: Urban Bias in Poverty Policy." Focus, 4(2): 5-8.

Jensen, Leif. 1987. "Rural Minority Families in the United States: A Twenty-Year Profile of Poverty and Economic Well-Being." Paper presented at the 50th annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Madison, WI, August.

Knudsen, Patrick L. 1987. "After Long, Bruising Battle, House Approves Welfare Bill." Congressional Quarterly, December 19: 3157-3165.

Levitan, Sar A. 1985. Programs in Aid of the Poor. Fifth Edition. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Murray, Charles. 1984. Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Rodgers, Harrell R., Jr. and Gregory Weiher. 1986. "The Rural Poor in America: A Statistical Overview." Policy Studies Journal, 15(2): 279-290.

Schiller, Bradley R. 1980. The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination. Third Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1987. Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 157, "Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1986 (Advance Data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey), Washington, DC: USGPO.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1987. Characteristics of State Plans for Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Washington, DC: USGPO.

Watkins, Julia M. and Dennis A. Watkins. 1984. Social Policy and the Rural Setting. New York, NY: Springer.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Table 1

Poverty and Welfare Receipt
Among Nonmetro and Metro Families

	Nonmetro	Metro	
	Total	Total	Central City
Percent of families with income below poverty line	15.2	10.1	15.4
Percent of families with income below .75 of poverty line	10.3	6.9	11.2
Percent of families with income below .5 of poverty line	6.1	4.0	6.6
Mean Total Family Income (1986 dollars)	$26,495	$36,364	$31,314
Mean Total Family Earnings (1986 dollars)	$20,514	$30,118	$25,340
Percent of families that received welfare income	5.9	5.8	10.3
Mean welfare income among recipient families	$2,928	$3,652	$3,911
N (weighted*)	9,704	32,589	10,177

* CPS weight is divided by mean weight to yield total N approximately equal to CPS sample size.

Source: March 1987 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau

Table 2

Nonmetro/Metro Differences in the Ameliorative Effect of Welfare on Poverty

	Nonmetro	Metro	
Ameliorative Effect Measures	Total	Total	Central City
Percent with pre-welfare income below poverty brought above poverty by welfare	1.9	4.0	4.8
Percent with pre-welfare income below .75 of poverty brought above .75 of poverty by welfare	5.9	10.0	10.3
Percent with pre-welfare income below .50 of poverty brought above .50 of poverty by welfare	19.7	29.4	33.0
Mean proportion of pre-welfare poverty gap that is closed by welfare	15.9	28.8	31.4

Source: March 1987 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 3

Ordinary Least Squares Regression of
Ameliorative Effect of Welfare
(Standaridized Coefficients with Unstandardized
Coefficients in Parentheses)

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Type of Residence			
Metro outside central city	-.026 (-.052)	-.006 (-.011)	.035* (.067)
Nonmetro	-.077** (-.156)	-.041** (-.082)	.007 (.014)
State AFDC Benefit Level		.143** (.001)	.085** (.001)
Receipt of Welfare			.302** (.581)
Constant	(.314)	(-.066)	(-.219)
R^2	.005	.024	.109
N	4513	4513	4513

* Significant at $p < .05$.
** Significant at $p < .01$

Source: March 1987 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 4

Matrix of Correlations for Variables
Used in Logistic Regression of Welfare Receipt

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Welfare Rcpt	(1)	----										
Met not city	(2)	-.056	----									
Nonmetro	(3)	-.126	-.505	----								
Did not work	(4)	.276	-.068	-.093	----							
Child present	(5)	.295	.016*	-.072	-.203	----						
Married couple	(6)	-.260	.017*	.108	-.037	-.269	----					
Non-white	(7)	.172	-.155	-.234	.134	.074	-.183	----				
Age	(8)	-.286	-.020*	.094	.264	-.674	.345	-.067	----			
Own home	(9)	-.363	.051	.199	-.030	-.318	.269	-.227	.433	----		
Education	(10)	-.014	.072	-.038	-.215	.222	-.157	-.182	-.328	-.046	----	
AFDC-UP state	(11)	.261	-.001*	-.174	.113	.100	-.054	-.091	-.108	-.127	.132	----
State AFDC pay	(12)	.233	-.014*	-.183	.086	.096	-.071	-.056	-.115	-.152	.125	.786

* Correlation not significant at $p < .05$.

Source: March 1987 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.

Table 5

Logistic Regression of Receipt
of Welfare Income Among the Pre-Welfare Poor[a]

Independent Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Type of Residence				
Metro outside central city	-.338**	-.267**	-.231**	-.025
Nonmetro	-.520**	-.432**	-.324**	.013
Head did not work last year		.558**	.781**	.746**
Own children < 18 present			.894**	.573**
Married couple head			-.459**	-.362**
Head is non-white				.108*
Head's age				-.012**
Family's home is owned				-.532**
Head's education				-.039**
Family's state offers AFDC-UP				.480**
State benefit level				.000
Intercept	5.061	4.713	3.992	4.672
N	4,513	4,513	4,513	4,513

[a] Cell entries are SPSS-X logistic regression coefficients.

* Significant at $p < .05$.
** Significant at $p < .01$

Source: March 1987 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau.